

REMARKS

Applicants submit this Amendment in reply to the Office Action mailed March 21, 2006.

In this Amendment, Applicants amend the specification and Abstract of the Disclosure to improve clarity. Applicants also cancel, without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 24-38; amend claim 1 to better define the claimed invention by amending “is a quarter of” to recite “is less than half of”; and add new claim 39. Additionally, Applicants make other amendments to claim 1 and amend claims 2, 3, 6-11, and 14-23 to improve clarity. No claim amendments are made in response to the Examiner’s rejection, and it is respectfully submitted that the claims—as originally filed—are patentable.

Before entry of this Amendment, claims 1-38 were pending in this application. After entry of the Amendment, claims 1-23 and 39 are pending in the application.

The originally filed specification, claims, Abstract of the Disclosure, and drawings fully support the amendments to the specification, Abstract of the Disclosure, and claims 1-3, 6-11, and 14-23, and the addition of new claim 39. No new matter is introduced.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,790,165 to Kuboki et al. (“Kuboki”). The Examiner also objected to claims 17-23, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's statement that claims 17-23 are allowable.

Kuboki

In a section of Kuboki identified by the Examiner, Fig. 15 illustrates "the structure of the digital color copying machine of the [third] embodiment." Kuboki, c. 15/ll. 50-51. In Fig. 15, "[t]he control unit 3111 is operated according to an input instruction from an operation unit 3010 and digitizer 3114 in a case where the subject apparatus is operated as a color copying machine." Id., c. 15/ll. 60-63. And "[t]he operation unit 3010 has a display formed by a liquid crystal display (LCD display) and a touch panel made of a transparent electrode located on the surface of the display, so that a selective instruction such as an instruction of color conversion and an instruction of an editorial operation can be made." Id., c. 15/l. 64 - c. 16/l. 2. Thus, the third embodiment of Kuboki appears to disclose a digital color copying machine that has an LCD (Applicants note that the LCD does not even appear to be shown in the figures). However, Applicants submit that Kuboki does not appear to disclose either a method of driving the LCD or circuitry for driving the LCD. In other words, the sections of the specification and figures of Kuboki cited by the Examiner discuss, for example, components and circuits of an image processing apparatus, such as the digital color copying machine of the third embodiment. But Applicants submit that they do not disclose a method of driving the LCD of operation unit 3010 or circuitry for driving the LCD of operation unit 3010.

Additionally, to the extent that the third embodiment of Kuboki might be interpreted to disclose branching original image data having an original data rate into branched plural-systems image data, Applicants submit that it does not disclose supplying a source driver circuit of the LCD with that branched plural-systems image data. Further, because Kuboki does not appear to disclose gray-scale voltage signals, Kuboki does not disclose branching branched plural-systems image data into gray-scale voltage signals.

As a result, Applicants submit that Kuboki does not disclose at least the following recitations of claim 1: “[a] method of driving a liquid crystal display device”, “branching original image data having an original data rate into branched plural-systems image data [and] supplying a source driver circuit with said branched plural-systems image data”, or “allowing said source driver circuit to further branch said branched plural-systems image data into gray-scale voltage signals”. Similarly, Applicants submit that Kuboki does not disclose at least the following recitations of claim 9: “[a] circuitry for driving a liquid crystal display device”, “a timing controller for generating image data and at least one clock signal [and] a plurality of source driver circuits for incorporating said image data in synchronization with said at least one clock signal”, or “a plurality of source driver circuits for incorporating said image data in synchronization with said at least one clock signal and converting said image data into gray-scale voltage signals”.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)—Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, “[a] method of driving a liquid crystal display device having a plurality of bus lines for transmitting image data”, “branching original image data having an

original data rate into branched plural-systems image data”, “supplying a source driver circuit with said branched plural-systems image data”, and “allowing said source driver circuit to further branch said branched plural-systems image data into gray-scale voltage signals”. But, as discussed above, Kuboki does not even disclose a method of driving a liquid crystal display device, much less branching original image data having an original data rate into branched plural-systems image data and supplying a source driver circuit with the branched plural-systems image data, or allowing said source driver circuit to further branch said branched plural-systems image data into gray-scale voltage signals, as required by claim 1.

Because “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference” MPEP 2131 (8th ed., Rev. 3, Aug. 2005), quoting Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987), and because “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim” MPEP 2131 (8th ed., Rev. 3, Aug. 2005), quoting Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989), Applicants submit that claim 1 is not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the cited references, including Kuboki and the other art of record.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)—Dependent Claims 2-8

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-8 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the cited references, including Kuboki and the other art of record, at least due to the direct dependency of claims 2-8 from independent claim 1.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)—Independent Claim 9

Claim 9 recites, inter alia, “[a] circuitry for driving a liquid crystal display device”, “a timing controller for generating image data and at least one clock signal”, “a plurality of source driver circuits for incorporating said image data in synchronization with said at least one clock signal”, and “a plurality of source driver circuits for incorporating said image data in synchronization with said at least one clock signal and converting said image data into gray-scale voltage signals”. But, as discussed above, Kuboki does not disclose circuitry for driving a liquid crystal display device, a timing controller for generating image data and at least one clock signal and a plurality of source driver circuits for incorporating the image data in synchronization with the at least one clock signal, or a plurality of source driver circuits for incorporating said image data in synchronization with said at least one clock signal and converting said image data into gray-scale voltage signals.

And, as discussed above, because “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference” MPEP 2131 (8th ed., Rev. 3, Aug. 2005), quoting Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987), and because “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim” MPEP 2131 (8th ed., Rev. 3, Aug. 2005), quoting Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989), Applicants submit that claim 9 is not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the cited references, including Kuboki and the other art of record.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)—Dependent Claims 10-23

Applicants submit that dependent claims 10-23 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the cited references, including Kuboki and the other art of record, at least due to the direct or indirect dependency of claims 10-23 from independent claim 9.

New Dependent Claim 39

Applicants submit that claim 39 is patentable over the cited references, including Kuboki and the other art of record, at least due to the direct dependency of claim 39 from independent claim 1.

Request for Reconsideration and Allowance


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/026,688

Attorney Docket No. Q67203

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence F. Galvin
Registration No. 44,694

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: 202.293.7060
Facsimile: 202.293.7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 21, 2006